



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

SP

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,544	01/03/2001	Edward J. Zylka	MOT-D2410	1731
24375	7590	06/03/2005	EXAMINER	
VOLPE AND KOENIG, P.C.			TIV, BACKHEAN	
DEPT. MOT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
UNITED PLAZA, SUITE 1600			2151	
30 SOUTH 17TH STREET				
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103				
DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/753,544	ZYLKA ET AL.
	Examiner Backhean Tiv	Art Unit 2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

Detailed Action

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. This is a response to the RCE filed on 3/16/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 8,9,12,13,14,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "more extensive" in claims 8,9,12,13,14,15 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "more extensive" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 7,8,10,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,789,077 issued to Slaughter et al.(Slaughter) in view of

US Patent 6,760,720 issued to De Bellis in further view of US Patent 6,360,254 issued to Linden et al(Linden).

As per claim 1,8,10,14, Slaughter teaches an information system for selectively providing information in response to a request from a user(Abstract), the information system comprising:

receiving said request from said user(col.10, lines12-13);

analyzing said request(col.10, lines 8-20);

a first memory, for storing a first database of information(col.10, lines 8-30; it is implicit that there is a first memory with a database because the user is sending requests for spaces, these spaces has to be stored somewhere);

a second memory, for storing a second database of information, at least a portion of the information in the second database not being in the first database(col.8, lines 18-21);

a first search unit, for analyzing said request and retrieving information related to said request from said first database to generate a first output(col.10, lines 8-46);

a second search unit, for analyzing said first output and retrieving information related to said first output from said second database to generate a second output which includes additional information not included in the first output(col10, lines 47-57).

Slaughter however does not explicitly teach a webpage unit for receiving said first output and second output information and selectively displaying said first output and said second output signals on a webpage; and an output unit, for generating an e-mail to said user which includes the address of said webpage.

De Bellis teaches a webpage unit for receiving said first output and second output information and selectively displaying said first output and said second output signals on a webpage(col.3, lines 55-col.4, line 8) and further teaches multiple databases(Fig.1).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one ordinary skilled in the art to modify the teachings of Slaughter to add a webpage unit for receiving said first output and second output information and selectively displaying said first output and said second output signals on a webpage and to explicitly use multiple databases as taught by De Bellis in order to provide information to the user through a webpage(De Bellis, Fig.13).

One ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine Slaughter and De Bellis in order to provide a system to display search results (De Bellis, col.2, lines 30-54).

Slaughter in view of De Bellis however does not explicitly teach an output unit, for generating an e-mail to said user which includes the address of said webpage.

Linden explicitly teaches an output unit, for generating an e-mail to said user which includes the address of said webpage(Abstract).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one ordinary skilled in the art to modify the teachings of Slaughter in view of De Bellis to add a webpage address to an email as taught by Linden in order to for user to access private web pages(Linden, col.1, lines 10-15).

One ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been

motivated to combine the teachings of Slaughter, De Bellis, and Linden in order to provide a system to efficiently and securely access private web pages and other types of restricted resources(Linden, col.1, lines 10-15).

As per claim 4, whereby said first and second search units comprise a single search unit(De Bellis, col.3, lines 55-col.4, lines 9). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 7, whereby said first database is remotely located from said second database(De Bellis, Fig.1, elements 12, 13). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1.

Claims 2,5-6,9,11-13,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,789,077 issued to Slaughter et al.(Slaughter) in view of US Patent 6,760,720 issued to De Bellis in further view of US Patent 6,360,254 issued to Linden et al(Linden) in further view US Patent 6,256,663 issued to Davis.

Slaughter in view of De Bellis in further view of Linden teaches all the limitations of claim 1, however does not teach as per claim 2, the information system of claim 1 further including a security system for permitting limited access to said information system upon the receipt of an access code; wherein said e-mail further includes said access code for permitting access to said webpage by said user.

Davis teaches further including a security system for permitting limited access to said information system upon the receipt of an access code(col.1,lines 57-59); wherein

said e-mail further includes said access code for permitting access to said webpage by said user(col.5,line 33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Slaughter in view of De Bellis in further view of Linden to add further including a security system for permitting limited access to said information system upon the receipt of an access code; wherein said e-mail further includes said access code for permitting access to said webpage by said user as taught by Davis in order to acquire feedback regarding products (Davis, col.1,lines 14-21).

One ordinary skill in the art would combine Slaughter, De Bellis, Linden and Davis in order to provide a system for authorized users to certain information(Davis, col.5, lines 32-34).

Claims 5 and 12 are of the same scope as a combination of claims 1 and 2, therefore are rejected based on the same rationale (see claim 1 and 2 rejection).

Motivation to combine set forth in claim 1 and 2.

As per claim 6, the method of claim 5, wherein said access information comprises: a URL to locate the webpage(Davis, col.1,line 57) and an access code to permit viewing of said selective display by said user(Davis, col.1,lines 58-59). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 5.

Claims 9,11,15 are of the same scope as claim 2, therefore are rejected based on the same rationale (see claim 2 rejection). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 2.

Claim 13 is of the same scope as claim 6, therefore are rejected based on the same rationale (see claim 6 rejection). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 6.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,789,077 issued to Slaughter et al.(Slaughter) in view of US Patent 6,760,720 issued to De Bellis in further view of US Patent 6,360,254 issued to Linden et al(Linden) in further view of Office Notice.

Slaughter in view of De Bellis in further view of Linden does not explicitly teach as per claim 3, whereby said first and second memories are portions of a single memory.

Office Notice is taken; it is obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have two memories be part of a single memory in order to store information in one place.

One ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine Slaughter, De Bellis, Linden and to have two memories be part of a single memory in order to reduce cost by having data stored in one memory instead of several memories.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Backhean Tiv whose telephone number is (571)272-3941. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 A.M.-12 P.M. and 1 -6 P.M. Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BT
Backhean Tiv
2151
5/26/05


ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER